

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

1776 E. Washington Street  
Urbana, IL 61801

DATE: January 16, 2020

PLACE: Lyle Shields Meeting Room  
1776 East Washington Street

TIME: 6:30 p.m.

Urbana, IL 61802

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tom Anderson, Ryan Elwell, Marilyn Lee, Jim Randol, Lee Roberts, Larry Wood

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Lori Busboom, Susan Burgstrom, John Hall

OTHERS PRESENT: Kyle Britt, Alex Wilson

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum

The roll was called, and a quorum declared present.

Mr. Elwell informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign the witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness register, they are signing an oath.

3. Correspondence - None

4. Approval of Minutes: December 12, 2019

Mr. Elwell entertained a motion to approve the December 12, 2019, minutes.

Ms. Lee moved, seconded by Mr. Randol, to approve the December 12, 2019, minutes.

Mr. Elwell asked the Board if there were any necessary additions or corrections to the December 12, 2019, minutes, and there were none.

The motion carried by voice vote.

Mr. Elwell entertained a motion to re-arrange the agenda and hear Case 968-AM-19 prior to Cases 947-AT-19 and 971-AT-19.

Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Ms. Lee, to re-arrange the agenda and hear Case 968-AM-19 prior to Cases 947-AT-19 and 971-AT-19. The motion carried by voice vote.

1  
2 **5. Continued Public Hearing**  
3

4 **Case 947-AT-19** Petitioner: **Zoning Administrator Request to amend the Champaign County Zoning**  
5 **Ordinance by amending the requirements for PV solar farms by deleting Section 6.1.4 B.(2)b. that**  
6 **requires a 0.5 mile separation between a proposed PV solar farm and the CR Conservation**  
7 **Recreation Zoning District.**  
8

9 Mr. Elwell informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign the  
10 witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness register,  
11 they are signing an oath. He asked the audience if anyone desired to sign the witness register and there was  
12 no one.  
13

14 Mr. Elwell asked the petitioner if he would like to make a statement regarding his request.  
15

16 Mr. John Hall, Zoning Administrator, stated that nothing has changed except that the case originally had two  
17 parts and when one of those parts required re-advertising, it was separated from Case 947-AT-19 and  
18 became Case 971-AT-19. He said that currently, Case 947-AT-19 is only about removing Section 6.1.5  
19 B.(2)b. which requires a 0.5 mile separation between a proposed PV solar farm and the CR Conservation  
20 Recreation Zoning District. He noted that there is no new information for the Board to review and he hoped  
21 that the Board was ready to proceed with final action.  
22

23 Ms. Lee stated that it is her opinion that keeping the 0.5-mile separation is appropriate considering that it is  
24 the Conservation-Recreation Zoning District. She realizes that there have been many cases that have been  
25 decided allowing the use to be closer than 0.5 miles, but those approvals should not justify changing the  
26 ordinance itself.  
27

28 Mr. Randol stated that each case that comes before this Board could have a special reason or issue that may  
29 necessitate a special condition. He said that he supports the proposed change in Case 947-AT-19.  
30

31 Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Hall to indicate the required separation between the CR zoning district and wind  
32 turbines.  
33

34 Mr. Hall, Zoning Administrator, stated that the separation is one mile, because wind turbines involve a lot  
35 more wildlife impacts.  
36

37 Mr. Anderson agreed because wind farms are very active and solar panels are very passive.  
38

39 Mr. Hall stated that the solar panels are not only very passive, but with the vegetative plantings that are  
40 required inside the array and how many of the solar farm developers install fencing that allows some wildlife  
41 to pass through the fence, all and all it is really an improvement due to the permanent vegetation that always  
42 exists. He said that if it were a CR zoning district near a bunch of homes, then the Board would be looking  
43 at a separation from the proximity to residences, but basically, for the CR Zoning District he sees no need  
44 for the separation, and it would be better to do away with it.  
45

46 Mr. Wood stated that given that the solar farm developers have their own protections for wildlife  
47 conservation, he sees no reason for maintaining the 0.5-mile separation. He said that the 0.5-mile separation  
48 has a significant financial impact on the solar farm developers for placement; therefore, Mr. Wood agreed to

1 the proposed change.

2

3 Mr. Elwell asked the Board how they would like to proceed.

4

5 **Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Mr. Wood, to adopt the Finding of Fact and Documents of Record,**  
6 **and Summary Finding of Fact, as submitted, and move to the Final Determination for Case 947-AT-**  
7 **19. The motion carried by voice vote.**

8

9 **FINAL DETERMINATION FOR CASE 947-AT-19:**

10

11 **Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Mr. Wood that pursuant to the authority granted by Section 9.2**  
12 **of the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance, the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County**  
13 **recommends that:**

14

15 **The Zoning Ordinance Amendment requested in Case 947-AT-19 should BE ENACTED**  
16 **by the County Board in the form attached hereto.**

17

18 Mr. Elwell requested a roll call vote.

19

20 The roll call vote was a follows:

21

22	<b>Roberts – yes</b>	<b>Wood - yes</b>	<b>Anderson – yes</b>
23	<b>Lee - no</b>	<b>Randol – yes</b>	<b>Elwell - yes</b>

24

25

26 **6. New Public Hearings**

27

28 **Case 968-AM-19 Petitioner: Kyle Britt and Alex Wilson, d.b.a. Big Rig Diesel Service LLC. Request**  
29 **to amend the Zoning Map to change the zoning district designation from the AG-1 Agriculture**  
30 **District to the B-3 Highway business District for a Major Automobile Repair Shop. Location: A newly**  
31 **created 6.8 acre tract in the Northwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter and the Southwest Quarter**  
32 **of the Northwest Quarter of Section 12, Township 18 North, Range 10 East of the Third Principal**  
33 **Meridian in Sidney Township, commonly known as part of the form Agrigenetics tract with an**  
34 **address of 2310 CR 1050 North (County Highway 15, Homer.**

35

36 Mr. Elwell informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign the  
37 witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness register,  
38 they are signing an oath. He asked the audience if anyone desired to sign the witness register and there was  
39 no one.

40

41 Mr. Elwell asked the petitioners if they would like to make a statement regarding their request.

42

43 Mr. Alex Wilson, who resides at 134 W. Orleans Street, Paxton, stated that he and Mr. Britt are requesting  
44 that the old Agrigenetics property be rezoned from AG-1, Agriculture to B-3, Highway Business so that they  
45 can operate a shop on the property.

46

47 Mr. Elwell asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Wilson.

48 Ms. Lee stated that the house located to the east is fairly close. She asked Mr. Wilson if he and Mr. Britt had

1 discussed their proposed use with the owner of the home.

2  
3 Mr. Wilson stated that two weekends ago, the owner of the house contacted him indicating that the house is  
4 a rental and that there were no concerns. Mr. Wilson stated that he completely informed the owner of the  
5 house about the intended use of the 6.8-acre tract and the hours of operation. He informed the owner of the  
6 house that his lot supplies the water to the house and that there is a driveway easement for access to the  
7 home. Mr. Wilson stated that the owner of the house indicated that she had no issues regarding the  
8 proximity of the intended use to the house and he agrees. He said that any trucks or trailers that would come  
9 to the shop would arrive and exit the property from the west side via the large existing driveway.

10  
11 Ms. Lee stated that she is very familiar with the parcel because she drives past it every time she goes to  
12 Champaign.

13  
14 Mr. Randol asked Mr. Wilson to indicate the shop's hours of operation.

15  
16 Mr. Wilson stated that the shop would be open to the public from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., although as the  
17 owners, he and Mr. Britt will typically be there from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. He said that the extra hour in  
18 the morning allows them the opportunity to get caught up on paperwork and scheduling, and the hour in the  
19 evening provides the opportunity for ordering necessary parts. He said that occasionally, like most business  
20 owners, they are at the shop later in the evening, but that is only to finalize paperwork and invoicing.

21  
22 Ms. Lee stated that the memorandum indicated that the subject property is an ideal location for this type of  
23 business along County Highway 15, and the only businesses that are within the 10 miles between County  
24 Road 2500 East and Route 130 are agricultural related, except for the church and the school.

25  
26 Mr. Wilson noted that, along that same route, there is an automotive shop inside the Village of Sidney that  
27 has a tall enough door to accommodate a semi-truck.

28  
29 Ms. Lee stated that she was only discussing the rural areas of the County and not the Village of Sidney.

30  
31 Mr. Kyle Britt, who resides at 412 Deerpath Street, Tolono, stated that 60 to 70 percent of their customers  
32 are local area farmers who haul in and out of the Frito-Lay facility that is directly across the road from the  
33 subject property.

34  
35 Ms. Lee stated that after being married to a farmer for almost 40 years, she understands that grain trucks are  
36 bigger than they were 40 years ago. She said that the memorandum indicates that there are agriculture and  
37 residential uses to the south of the subject property, although Frito-Lay incorporates the entire area to the  
38 south; therefore, it should be noted that there is no residential use to the south of the subject property, only  
39 agricultural use.

40  
41 Mr. Elwell asked the Board if there were any additional questions for the petitioners.

42  
43 Mr. Tom Anderson stated that at some point during the hearing, the petitioners will need to agree to the  
44 proposed special conditions, and one of those special conditions will require the petitioners to apply for a  
45 Change of Use Permit. He asked the petitioners if they understood why they needed the rezoning and the  
46 Change of Use Permit and what both approvals mean.

47 Mr. Britt stated that the AG-1 Zoning District does not allow Major Automobile Repair, but the B-3 Zoning  
48 District does, which is why they are before the Board tonight with that request. He said that the need for the

1 Change of Use Permit is so that they can operate the same business as they currently operating outside of  
2 Rantoul. He said that they do major repairs to semi-trucks and trailers and since they work on some  
3 commercial vehicles, they would need the B-3 zoning to operate their business at this location.  
4

5 Mr. Wood asked Mr. Britt that since the proposed renovations are for Building #1, will it be the primary  
6 building that will be utilized for the business. He asked Mr. Britt if the other buildings that are listed as cold  
7 storage buildings would be used for any portion of the business.  
8

9 Mr. Britt stated that currently they listed the other buildings as cold storage because they were not sure what  
10 else they may use them for in the future. He said that they do not envision their business becoming larger  
11 than what Building #1 can accommodate. He said that if they do have a large repair job that gets put on the  
12 backburner, then they may store it in one of those buildings until they have time to bring it into the shop for  
13 repair.  
14

15 Ms. Lee asked the petitioners if they intend to use the present office building as part of their business  
16 operation.  
17

18 Mr. Wilson stated yes. He said that they will complete a small remodel of the office, but it will most likely  
19 just be painting and changing the front door for service. He said that they only require three offices, not  
20 fifteen, to do the required paperwork.  
21

22 Mr. Wood asked the petitioners to indicate how long the buildings have been vacant.  
23

24 Mr. Wilson stated that the previous tenants vacated the premises in early 2018, and he believes that it was  
25 June. He said that the previous owners had a caretaker that was getting rid of the seed and selling the  
26 equipment. He said that there has been someone at the facility every week even though they were closed to  
27 make sure that there were no water pipes burst, the heat and air conditioner was working, etc.  
28

29 Ms. Lee stated that it appeared that there were a number of employees at the facility after it closed.  
30

31 Mr. Wilson stated that they have completed a couple of walk throughs with the caretaker, although it has  
32 proven difficult due to scheduling. He said that they needed to get inside of the building so that their  
33 contractors could provide bids.  
34

35 Mr. Wood asked the petitioners to indicate the number of employees for the proposed business.  
36

37 Mr. Britt stated that currently they have themselves as full-time employees, one additional full-time  
38 employee and three part-time employees.  
39

40 Mr. Wilson stated that their current location keeps them very restricted because it is only a 6,000 square foot  
41 building with approximately 4,000 square feet as usable space for repairs and tools, supplies, etc. He said  
42 that they do have four full-time employee positions that they are hoping to fill after they relocate to the  
43 subject property, but currently they are stuck with the number of employees that they have because their  
44 landlord is not interested in expanding their current facility. He said that they had been researching other  
45 properties to relocate their business, and luckily enough the subject property was dropped in their laps with a  
46 reasonable price.  
47

48 Mr. Wood asked the petitioners if the collection of oil and oil spill materials are part of the renovation

1 process.

2

3 Mr. Britt stated that currently there is no area for collection of oil or oil spill materials, but there is an oil  
4 separator in the drain system. He said that they submitted a letter from Crystal Clean, their contracted used  
5 oil and parts cleaner service, indicating that they currently dispose of oil and oil spill materials/pig mats for  
6 Big Rig Diesel and that their services will be transferred to the new facility. Mr. Britt stated that they do  
7 have plastic containers and drain systems that will be taken to the new facility and will continue to contract  
8 with Crystal Clean.

9

10 Mr. Elwell asked the Board if there were any additional questions for the petitioners, and there were none.

11

12 Mr. Elwell asked staff if there were any questions for the petitioners, and there were none.

13

14 Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Hall to indicate what is required from the petitioners the property is rezoned from  
15 AG-1 to B-3.

16

17 Mr. Hall, Zoning Administrator, stated that nothing is required per se, because they have plenty of parking  
18 and it is an existing development with no increase in impervious area. He said that the only thing that is  
19 really required from the petitioners is the Change of Use Permit.

20

21 Mr. Anderson stated that there appears to be some confusion regarding the handouts. He said that the  
22 handout that was placed on his desk indicates a rezoning request for AG-2 to B-3, but the mailing materials  
23 indicate a rezoning request for AG-1 to B-3; he asked for clarification.

24

25 Mr. Hall stated that the indication of AG-2 to B-3 is a typo, because the current zoning of the property is  
26 AG-1.

27

28 Mr. Anderson asked if the only thing that the petitioners need to do is file the correct forms and pay the fee.

29

30 Mr. Hall stated yes, and the fee is only \$98.

31

32 Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Hall if there were any required permits for the proposed renovations of the current  
33 facility.

34

35 Mr. Hall stated no. He said that the proposed remodeling is small enough that it doesn't require any  
36 accessibility requirements. He said that this is literally a paperwork exercise, and not to belittle paperwork,  
37 but you couldn't do the paperwork if the rezoning was not in place.

38

39 Mr. Wilson stated that remodeling will only include the office space in Building #1 and the building behind  
40 it is a 160' x 80' freestanding shed. He said that whomever previously remodeled the office area of the  
41 building installed partition walls that are basically tin freestanding, non-load bearing walls. He said that  
42 they are only removing those freestanding walls and relocating two doors to the center.

43

44 Ms. Lee asked if there were approvals required for accessibility.

45 Mr. Hall stated that the petitioners are not making any changes and if they were adding new entry doors,  
46 they would need to be accessible, but the cost of the proposed remodeling is well under \$50,000.

47

48 Ms. Lee stated that the reuse of an existing building is pretty neat and prevents it from becoming abandoned

1 or dilapidated.

2  
3 Mr. Wilson noted that everything that they do is on one level and they do have pallet racks inside to store  
4 parts. He said that they have no use for anything that is not on ground level and there should be no concerns  
5 about accessibility.

6  
7 Ms. Lee stated that she was referring to handicapped parking. She said that, as she recalled, there is a  
8 concrete access in front of the office building that would easily accommodate the accessibility requirement.

9  
10 Mr. Wilson stated that there are one or more asphalt and stripped parking spaces located on the east side of  
11 the office building, and there are accessible doors on the east side as well.

12  
13 Mr. Elwell asked the Board and staff if there were any additional questions for the petitioners, and there  
14 were none.

15  
16 Mr. Elwell asked the Board how they would like to proceed.

17  
18 **Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Mr. Roberts, to accept the Findings of Fact, Documents of Record  
19 and Summary Finding of Fact, as submitted, and move to the Final Determination for Case 968-AM-  
20 19. The motion carried by voice vote.**

21  
22 Mr. Hall noted that the Board needs to review the proposed special conditions with the petitioner, and the  
23 petitioner must indicate whether they agree or disagree with those special conditions.

24  
25 Mr. Elwell read the proposed special condition A as follows:

26  
27 **A. The owners of the subject property hereby recognize and provide for the right of  
28 agricultural activities to continue on adjacent land consistent with the Right to Farm  
29 Resolution 3425.**

30  
31 **The above special condition is necessary to ensure the following:  
32 Conformance with Policy 4.2.3 of the Land Resource Management Plan.**

33  
34 Mr. Elwell asked the petitioners if they agreed with special condition A.

35  
36 Mr. Britt and Mr. Wilson indicated that they agreed with special condition A.

37  
38 Mr. Elwell read proposed special condition B. as follows:

39  
40 **B. A Change of Use Permit shall be applied for within 30 days of the approval of Case  
41 968-AM-19 by the County Board.**

42  
43 **The above special condition is required to ensure the following:  
44 The establishment of the proposed use shall be properly documented as  
45 required by the Zoning Ordinance.**

46  
47 Mr. Elwell asked the petitioners if they agreed with special condition B.

48

1 Mr. Britt and Mr. Wilson indicated that the agreed with special condition B.

2

3 Mr. Elwell entertained a motion to approve the special conditions.

4

5 **Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Mr. Wood, to approve the special conditions. The motion carried by**  
6 **voice vote.**

7

8 **Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Mr. Wood, to move to the Final Determination for Case 968-AM-**  
9 **19. The motion carried by voice vote.**

10

11 **FINAL DETERMINATION FOR CASE 968-AM-19:**

12

13 **Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Ms. Lee, that pursuant to the authority granted by Section 9.2 of the**  
14 **Champaign County Zoning Ordinance, the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County**  
15 **recommends that:**

16

17 **The Zoning Ordinance Amendment requested in Case 968-AM-19 should BE ENACTED by**  
18 **the County Board in the form attached hereto.**

19

20 **SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING SPECIAL CONDITIONS:**

21

22 **A. The owners of the subject property hereby recognize and provide for the right of**  
23 **agricultural activities to continue on adjacent land consistent with the Right to Farm**  
24 **Resolution 3425.**

25

26 **B. A Change of Use Permit shall be applied for within 30 days of the approval of Case**  
27 **968-AM-19 by the County Board.**

28

29 Mr. Elwell requested a roll call vote.

30

31 The roll was called as follows:

32

<b>Roberts – yes</b>	<b>Wood – yes</b>	<b>Anderson – yes</b>
<b>Lee – yes</b>	<b>Randol – yes</b>	<b>Elwell – yes</b>

34

35 Mr. Elwell stated that the Board would now hear Case 947-AT-19.

36

37 **Case 971-AT-19 Petitioner: Zoning Administrator Request to amend the Champaign County Zoning**  
38 **Ordinance by amending the requirements for PV solar farms in the following manner: Amend the**  
39 **requirements for a letter of credit in Section 6.1.5 Q.(4)e. to change the minimum acceptable long term**  
40 **corporate debt (credit) rating of the proposed financial institution to a rating of “A-” by Standard &**  
41 **Poor’s, or rating of “A3” by Moody’s, or a rating of “A-” by Kroll Bond Rating Agency.**

42 Mr. Elwell informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign the  
43 witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness register,  
44 they are signing an oath. He asked the audience if anyone desired to sign the witness register and there was  
45 no one.

46

47 Mr. Elwell asked the petitioner if he would like to make a statement regarding his request.

48



1  
2 Mr. John Hall, Zoning Administrator, stated that this case comes back before this Board due to it requiring  
3 re-advertisement. He said that during the last public hearing regarding this request, staff and the Board  
4 discussed that in order to accommodate the request for a bank headquartered in Champaign County to  
5 provide a rating, the minimum ratings needed to be lowered. He said that the rating is still in the same tier  
6 of risk and is a very small change, and the added benefit is not just allowing banks headquartered in  
7 Champaign County, but presumably allowing a much broader range of financial institutions to be eligible.  
8 He noted that there is one bank headquartered in Champaign County that could be eligible to do this. He said  
9 that this case is not as it originally came to the Board, but it is a good change and he would appreciate  
10 support from the ZBA.

11  
12 Mr. Elwell asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Hall.

13  
14 Mr. Wood stated that items I. and J. on page 8 of the Finding of Fact indicate that the proposed amendment  
15 is consistent with this purpose. He asked Mr. Hall to explain why these items are consistent and not  
16 relevant, because it doesn't make any sense to him since this amendment has to do with financials.

17  
18 Mr. Hall stated that he believes that these items indicating that the amendment is consistent is at a higher  
19 abstract level, because dividing the county into zones and adopting requirements makes this consistent, and  
20 because it is part of the whole structure of developing rules for solar farms and where they can go. He said  
21 that it could indicate not relevant, but that would not be true because it is setting up that system of rules  
22 whereby we allow solar farms.

23  
24 Mr. Wood stated that the word "stablished" in item J. should be revised to indicate "established."

25  
26 Mr. Elwell asked the Board if there were additional comments or questions for Mr. Hall.

27  
28 Ms. Lee asked if this amendment applies to the wind farm.

29  
30 Mr. Hall stated no, those amendments remain unchanged.

31  
32 Mr. Elwell asked the Board how they would like to proceed.

33  
34 **Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Mr. Wood, to adopt the Finding of Fact, Documents of Record, and**  
35 **Summary Finding of Fact, and proceed to the Final Determination for Case 971-AT-19. The motion**  
36 **carried by voice vote.**

37  
38 **FINAL DETERMINATION FOR CASE 971-AT-19**

39 **Mr. Wood moved, seconded by Mr. Randol, that pursuant to the authority granted by Section 9.2 of**  
40 **the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance, the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County**  
41 **recommends that:**

42 **The Zoning Ordinance Amendment requested in Case 971-AT-19 should BE ENACTED by**  
43 **the County Board in the form attached hereto.**

44  
45 Mr. Elwell requested a roll call vote.

46  
47 The roll call vote was as follows:

<b>Roberts – yes</b>	<b>Wood - yes</b>	<b>Anderson – yes</b>
<b>Lee - yes</b>	<b>Randol – yes</b>	<b>Elwell - yes</b>

7. **Staff Report - None**

8. **Other Business**

**A. Review of Docket**

Mr. Hall stated that the three other text amendments that were related to Case 948-AT-19 were reviewed by ELUC last week and they were all adopted, but after that meeting, staff received a municipal protest from the City of Urbana. He said that the text amendment passed through their Plan Commission, but when Case 948-AT-19, which specifically authorized a variance for the replacement of a nonconforming structure before it is damaged, came to the City of Urbana City Council, they thought that such a text amendment was a little too wild and would create problems for the City of Urbana, therefore protesting the amendment. He said that he and Ms. Burgstrom have discussed this, and he is not proposing any mitigation because staff could make the City of Urbana aware of any such variance requests that are within their extra-territorial jurisdiction even though they have no protest rights on variances. He said that he is going to see how ELUC reacts to the City of Urbana’s protest, and hopefully they will feel like that could be overridden by the County Board. He said that this is the first time in a couple of years that staff has received a protest for a proposed text amendment and it does not happen very often. He said that the protest did take him by surprise because the City of Urbana’s Plan Commission provided a recommendation to adopt. He said that he does understand the City of Urbana’s point, but a variance heard at a public hearing allows concerns about putting neighbors at risk by allowing a variance for a nonconforming structure and he will always trust the Zoning Board of Appeals to make that call.

Mr. Hall stated that the Board may have read in the paper about the proposed text amendment regarding cannabis related uses, and ELUC did approve that text amendment to be forwarded to the CCZBA. He said that staff plans to open that public hearing at the February 27<sup>th</sup> meeting, and it just so happens that staff received an inquiry this week related to a cannabis business use. He said that there will be two text amendment cases because ELUC wanted to look at it a couple of different ways and the County Board can take its pick. He said that since staff is receiving inquiries regarding cannabis related uses, the cases will be opened on February 27<sup>th</sup> and staff would like to receive a recommendation as soon as possible. He said that he has no idea what to expect when the public hearings for the two text amendments are opened, but he has continued the two cases on the docket for March 12<sup>th</sup> and March 26<sup>th</sup> in the hope that the Board would have enough time during those three public hearings to make a recommendation. He said that if the CCZBA could get those two cases done on March 26<sup>th</sup>, the County Board could take action in May. He said that July is the first round of approvals by the State, so there is a good chance that Champaign County’s rules could be in place without slowing anyone down, but there is no guarantee that there will be any approvals for cannabis related uses in Champaign County. He said that there will not be that many approvals for Champaign County during this first round of state approvals, but he hopes that the CCZBA can get the text amendment done within those three meetings.

Mr. Elwell asked if a home-rule municipality has a population greater than 25,000.

Mr. Hall stated that the County has one home-rule municipality below 20,000 and that is Rantoul, and they decided that they did not want to allow cannabis related uses. He said that staff is not proposing to allow any cannabis related uses within one-and-one half miles of Rantoul, which is why we have to distinguish

1 home rule municipalities with a population of less than 20,000, and home rule municipalities with a  
2 population of more than 20,000.

3  
4 Ms. Lee stated that she heard on the news that the Village of Homer was considering it, but she never heard  
5 what happened. She asked Mr. Hall if he had heard what the Village of Homer decided.

6  
7 Mr. Hall stated that he did not know.

8  
9 Mr. Elwell asked the Board to indicate any future absences.

10  
11 Mr. Elwell noted that it is possible that he would be absent from the February 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

12  
13 **9. Audience participation with respect to matters other than cases pending before the Board**

14  
15 None

16  
17 **10. Adjournment**

18  
19 Mr. Elwell entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

20  
21 **Mr. Randol moved, seconded by Ms. Lee, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by voice vote.**

22  
23 The meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

24  
25  
26 Respectfully submitted,

27  
28  
29  
30  
31 Secretary of Zoning Board of Appeals

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40